

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action of February 1, 2006, has been considered by the Applicants. Claim 19 has been amended. Claims 1, 3-9, 18, 22, and 38-40 have been cancelled. Claims 10, 11, 14, 16, 19-21, and 23-37 are pending. Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, 18, and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As these claims have been cancelled, this rejection is moot. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 3-11, 14, 16, and 18-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Applicants traverse the rejections.

The specific rejections of claim 1, 3, and 22 (and their dependent claims) are moot due to the cancellation of these claims.

With regards to the rejection of claim 19 and its dependent claims, Applicants have amended claim 19 to clarify that "said acrylate" refers to the fluoroalkyl (methyl)acrylate. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification. In original claim 19, specific fluoroacrylates are listed and an amount is given. In original claim 22, specific fluoroacrylates and alkylacrylates are listed and the amount of each acrylate is given. It is reasonable to imply that the amount listed in original claim 19 refers to the fluoroacrylates, which are listed, in light of the way the amounts are claimed in original claim 22. In the specification from page 13, line 10 to page 14, line 9, it is also clear that either monomer of the fluoropolymer (in the pictured formula) can be the fluoroacrylate. The mole fraction of either monomer is described as from about 0.01 to about 0.99. This description also supports the reading of the acrylate in claim 19 as the fluoroacrylate.

For the above reasons, withdrawal of the 112 rejections for indefiniteness is requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, 18, 22, and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kasuya. As these claims have been cancelled, this rejection is moot. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner previously indicated that claim 19 contained allowable subject matter. As the only rejection against claim 19 (and its dependent claims) was a 112 rejection, which has been corrected by this amendment, Applicants submit this application is now in condition for allowance.

The specification has been amended solely to update the status of the copending application.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, all pending claims (10, 11, 14, 16, 19-21, and 23-37) are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby authorized to call Richard M. Klein, at telephone number 216-861-5582, Cleveland, OH.

It is believed that no fee is due in conjunction with this response. If, however, it is determined that fees are due, authorization is hereby given for deduction of those fees, other than the issue fees, from Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH  
& McKEE LLP



---

Richard M. Klein (Reg. No. 33,000)  
1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
(216) 861-5582